



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

5W

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/286,530	04/05/1999	L. LAWRENCE CHAPOY	7651/1239	5116

23506 7590 03/15/2004

GARDNER GROFF, P.C.
PAPER MILL VILLAGE, BUILDING 23
600 VILLAGE TRACE
SUITE 300
MARIETTA, GA 30067

EXAMINER

PREBILIC, PAUL B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3738

DATE MAILED: 03/15/2004

30

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/286,530

Applicant(s)

CHAPOY ET AL.

Examiner

Paul B. Prebilio

Art Unit

3738

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 January 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-17,19-22 24-40, and 42-55 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 24-39 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-17,19-22, 40, and 42-55 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____

Claims 24-39 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected invention or species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in Paper No. 6 of October 6, 2000.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2, 4-14, 40, 42, and 44-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Patel et al (US 6,158,862) in view of Patel (US 5,252,262) and Kearns et al (US 5,074,942). Patel et al discloses an apparently monolithically produced intraocular lens with haptics of the same material, but fails to disclose a coating on at least the distal portions of the haptics as claimed; see Figure 2 and column 4, lines 7-29. The material use to make the intraocular lens and haptics is considered to be a transparent material even though some of it is treated with blue-blocking dye. This is due to the fact that at least the base material is a transparent material. Alternatively, even if the material is colored, it is still considered to be transparent because it is merely a colored transparent material.

However, Patel ('262) teaches that it was known to coat haptics on similar intraocular lenses with polyimide in order prevent dye or pigment leakage; see the whole document, especially Figures 26-27 and column 4, lines 15-57.

Furthermore, Kearns teaches that it was known to make monolithic lenses and haptics from the same material; see the abstract.

Hence, it is the Examiner's position that it would have been obvious to make the intraocular lens monolithically as taught by Kearns, for the reasons that Kearns does the same, and to clear coat at least the haptics of Patel et al in order to prevent dye leakage which is a concern to Patel et al as well; see column 4, lines 7-14.

With regard to claims 2, 9-14 and 44-53, the product-by-process steps are only given weight to the extent that they affect the final product with little burden on the Examiner's part to meet the claim language; see MPEP 2113, which is incorporated herein by reference thereto. Hence, it is the Examiner's position that the claim product-by-process limitations result in an identical, or alternatively, a substantially identical product to that disclosed by Patel et al as modified by Patel such that the claims are clearly unpatentable thereover.

With regard to claim 6, HEMA is synonymous with 2-hydroxyethylmethacrylate such that the claim language is fully met.

With regard to claim 8, the 550 nm or 400 nm wavelength range is within the UV radiation range, and thus, the dye of Patel et al is a UV absorbing compound to the extent required by the claims; see Patel et al on column 4, lines 1-29.

With regard to claim 40 and 42-53, the polyimide as claimed is the same material as that set forth by Patel, such that it would inherently have the same fibrosis promotion affect.

Art Unit: 3738

With regard to claim 54, the Examiner has interpreted "hydroacrylic acid" as being another way of writing "hydroxyacrylic acid." Therefore, since HEMA or hydroxyethyl methacrylate is a type of hydroxyacrylic acid, the Examiner interprets Patel ('862) as disclosing the claimed material; see column 4, lines 7-14.

Claims 15-17, 19-22, 43, and 55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Patel et al, Kearns et al and Patel ('262) as applied to claims 1, 2, 4-14, 40, 42, and 44-53 above, and further in view of Cumming (US 5,047,051). Patel et al meets the claim language except for the footplate or an opposing set of plates with grooves as claimed. Cumming, however, teaches that it was known to make haptics into opposing plate or footplate forms with grooves; see the figures and the rest of the document. Hence, it is the Examiner's position that it would have been obvious to make the polyimide coated haptics of Patel et al as modified by Patel into a plate form and to coat the entire haptics thereof with polyamide for the same reasons that Cumming forms his haptics into that form.

With regard to claim 55, the Examiner has interpreted "hydroacrylic acid" as being another way of writing "hydroxyacrylic acid." Therefore, since HEMA or hydroxyethyl methacrylate is a type of hydroxyacrylic acid, the Examiner interprets Patel ('862) as disclosing the claimed material; see column 4, lines 7-14.

Claims 1, 2, 5, 7-14, 20, 22, 40, 42, and 44-53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kearns et al (US 5,074,942) in view of Patel (US 5,252,262).

Kearns discloses a monolithically produced intraocular lens where the lens and haptic have the same composition as required by the present claims; see the abstract and the figures. The entire device can be made of polymethylmethacrylate or PMMA; see for example, column 3, lines 24-56. It is noted that the haptics are colored and there is a concern that the dye may leak into the eye; see column 6, lines 16-48. The material used to make the intraocular lens and haptics is considered to be a transparent material even though some of it is treated with a colorant. This is due to the fact that at least the base material is a transparent material. Alternatively, even if the material is colored, it is still considered to be transparent because it is merely a colored transparent material. However, Kearns fails to disclose that the haptics can be coated with a polyimide coating as claimed.

However, Patel teaches that it was known to coat the haptic with a clear coating of the PMMA, polyethylene or polyimide in order to prevent leaking of the dye into the eye; see column 4, lines 29-34.

Therefore, it is the Examiner's position that it would have been obvious to clear coat the colored haptics of Kearns with a polyimide coating as a precaution against dye leakage.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed December 17, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant traverses the obviousness rejections arguing that the lenses of Kearns and Patel ('862) are not transparent because the haptics are colored or dyed. However,

Art Unit: 3738

the Examiner has modified the rejection to explain why Kearns and Patel still meet the claim language. Furthermore, Meshel (US 4,744,647) and Bello (US 5,919,227) are cited to show that the art can view colored materials as also being transparent; see Meshel on column 1, lines 30-33 and see Bello on column 2, lines 11-17. Therefore, it is the Examiner's position that the claim language is fully met to the extent that the new language "transparent" can be given patentable weight.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Meshel (US 4,744,647) and Bello (US 5,919,227) were cited to show that colored materials can be considered transparent to the art; see the previously cited portion thereof.

Applicant should specifically point out the support for any amendments made to the disclosure, including the claims (MPEP 714.02 and 2163.06). Due to the procedure outlined in MPEP 2163.06 for interpreting claims, it is noted that other art may be applicable under 35 USC 102 or 35 USC 103(a) once the aforementioned issue(s) is/are addressed.

Applicant is respectfully requested to provide a list of all copending applications that set forth similar subject matter to the present claims. A copy of such copending claims is respectfully requested in response to this Office action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paul Prebilic whose telephone number is (703) 308-2905. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 6:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Corrine McDermott, can be reached on (703) 308-2111. The fax phone number for this Technology Center is (703) 872-9306.

Art Unit: 3738

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Technology Center 3700 receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0858.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Paul Prebilic", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Paul Prebilic
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3738